

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 15-26, 28-30 and 32-36 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 1, 12 and 25 have been amended. No new matter is being added by way of this amendment.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2

The Examiner is rejecting Claims 1-2, 4-12, 15-26, 28-30 and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2, as being unclear as to the ramp feature. In response, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 12 and 25 to indicate a ramp feature having a ramp up toward an external side and a ramp down toward an internal side. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least in paragraph [0020] and in Figure 7. Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claims 1, 12 and 25 now fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2 and the rejection should be removed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103¶

The Examiner is rejecting Claims 1-2, 4-12, 15-26, 28-30 and 32-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Zapalski et al., (U.S. Pat. App. 2004/0042623, hereinafter "Zapalski") in view of Kan-o (U.S. Patent No. 6,910,217, hereinafter "Kan-o"). As recognized by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action, Zapalski fails to disclose or fairly suggest a disk guide wherein the disk guide includes a ramp feature. As indicated above, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12 and 25 to indicate a ramp feature having a ramp up toward an external side and a ramp down toward an internal side not shown or implied by Kan-o. Therefore, Applicant respectfully

submits that there would have been no teaching, suggestion or motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Zapalski with Kan-o to produce the device of amended independent Claims 1, 12, and 25 and the rejection should be removed.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-11, 15-24, 26, 28-30 and 32-36 depend from amended independent Claims 1, 12, and 25, and thus inherit all of the limitations of the amended independent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that dependent Claims 2, 4-11, 15-24, 26, 28-30 and 32-36 are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as given above for the amended independent Claims 1, 12 and 25.

Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (408) 720-8300.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Any necessary extension of time for response not already requested is hereby requested. Please charge any corresponding fee to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Sept. 25, 2009



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085
(408) 720-8300